

1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1155 Sacramento, California 95814 (916) 657-2666 FAX (916) 654-9780

April 1, 1997

Stuart Pyle 3707 Panorama Drive Bakersfield, CA 93306 Howard Frick 11401 South Vineland Road Bakersfield, CA 93307-9462

Dear Stu and Howard:

This is in response to your letter of January 22, 1997 regarding the draft water use efficiency common program. I appreciate your thoughtful comments and your continuing willingness to help us develop this component and resolve difficult issues related to water use efficiency.

As you know, the draft description of the common program has been revised slightly and edited substantially since you submitted your comments. We have incorporated changes based on your comments where there is some consensus among stakeholders. There are several significant issue that remain, and we are working to resolve them in several ways. First, we focused on these issues at the water use efficiency workshop on March 20. Second, staff will examine these issues during the process of component integration which we are now conducting, to see if some of these issues can be resolved better in the context of integrated program alternatives. Third, we will continue to support stakeholder efforts that can move us toward issue resolution, including formation and growth of the new Agricultural Water Management Council and the CUWA/EWC effort to resolve urban assurance issues. Finally, CALFED will consider water use efficiency assurance needs later in Phase II of the process when all other program assurance needs are better identified.

You commented that a "floor" level of urban conservation implementation is controversial. If such a floor were absolute and inflexible, this would be true. However, a flexible floor is exactly what stakeholders have voluntarily established in the urban MOU, with the essential provision that signatory water suppliers can exempt themselves from specific best management practices with certain justification.

Finally, you commented that an assurance of agricultural water use efficiency should not mean mandated performance. The approach that is proposed would avoid inflexible mandated performance. It identifies a voluntary stakeholder-developed program under the April 1, 1997

**CALFED Agencies** 

California

The Resources Agency
Department of Fish and Game
Department of Water Resources
California Environmental Protection Agency
State Water Resources Control Board

Federal

Environmental Protection Agency
Department of the Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service
Bureau of Reclamation
Department of Commerce
National Marine Fisheries Service

April 1, 1997 Page 2

agricultural MOU. If this voluntary approach does not achieve identified criteria for analysis and implementation, then an alternative approach could be implemented which draws on the precedent of the existing Urban Water Management Planning Act, first enacted in 1983.

Sincerely,

Lester A. Snow

**Executive Director**